DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 116 738 JC 760 057

TITLE	Preliminary Report [of the] Faculty Professional Growth Committee.
INSTITUTION	Saint Louis Junior Coll. District, Mo.
PUB DATE	Nov 74
NOTE	49p.; Some pages in appendices may reproduce poorly
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Effective Teaching; *Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Faculty Promotion; Instructional Staff; *Junior Colleges; Noninstructional Responsibility; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Participation
IDENTIFIERS	Saint Louis Junior College District

ABSTRACT

As a guide to its deliberations, the Faculty Professional Growth Committee of the St. Louis Junior College District prepared and distributed to all members of the professional teaching staff a questionnaire covering what should be included in faculty evaluations, how much weight should be given to each item, and whether teaching effectiveness could best be measured by performance or outcome. Approximately 300 faculty members responded, giving heaviest weight to classroom effectiveness, however measured; least weight to personal life style; and preference to performance over outcome as a means of measuring teaching effectiveness. With the help of the responses to the questionnaire, the committee produced this report which recommends that evaluations for faculty growth be kept separate from evaluations for promotion and retention, and makes some suggestions for ways of promoting growth. The report also specifies what should be considered in promotional evaluations, and the relative weight each item should be given. This report, accordingly, is divided into two parts, with part 1 addressed to growth and development, and part 2 addressed to criteria for promotional evaluation. The questionnaire and tabulated responses are appended. (NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED116738

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PRELIMINARY REPORT

Faculty Professional Growth Committee

2 November 1974

JC 760 057

St. Louis Junior College District

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH COMMITTEE
November, 1974

CONTENTS

Introduction. 1

Part I: Growth and Development 7
Diagnostic Techniques 7
a) Videotaping 8
b) Trained Observers 8
c) Student Input 8
Other Methods for Promoting Growth 10
a) Discipline Meetings 10
b) Cross-discipline Meetings 10
c) Methods Seminars. 11
d) Professional Conferences. 11

Part II: Criteria for Promotional Evaluation. 13
Section A: Required Categories 14
Classroom Effectiveness. 14
1) Class or Work Observation by Chairpersons or Supervisors 15
2) Class or Work Observation by Peers. 16
3) Student Evaluations 17
4) Self-evaluations. 19
Attendance and Reliability 19
Contributions to Department and Division 20
Keeping Up-to-date in the Field. 21
Section B: Optional Categories 22
(1) IMPORTANT. 22
Innovation in Teaching Methods; Course or Curriculum Development; Development of Instructional Materials 22
Ability to Work Smoothly with Peers and Supervisors 23
Willingness to Accept Advice or Help 23
Availability to Students Outside Required Office Hours. 24
(2) VALUABLE 24
Student Counseling and Placement 24
Work on College and District Committees. 25
Performing What You're Teaching. 25
Professional Publications and Exhibits 26
Consultation in Your Own Field 26
(3) USEFUL 27
Development of Community Service or Off-campus Courses 27
Unpaid Small Group Tutoring. 27

Student Placement in Community Jobs 27
Responsibility for Environmental Tasks. 28
Enrichment Courses Outside Your Field 28
Accumulation of Graduate Subject Matter Credits . . 29
Work Toward a Doctoral Degree 29
Attendance at In-service Courses. 29
Advising Student Clubs. 30
Community Service 30
Contributions to the Welfare of the College or District. 30
Section C: Factors to be Omitted from All Evaluations . . . 31
Personal Life Style 31
Political Activity Outside the Classroom. 32
Self Promotion. 32

Conclusion 33

Appendix I 35

Appendix II. 37

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH COMMITTEE

Amendments and errata:

p. 3, first line: delete "retention or promotion decisions" and insert "decisions about issuing contracts." Make this same change throughout the report, wherever the words "retention or promotion" are used.

p. 8, line 4: After the word 'Videotaping," insert "and/or audiotaping."

p. 13, 3rd line from the bottom: change "must" to "should";
2nd line from the bottom: change "but" to "and."

p. 14, line 3: insert "means" after "publicized."

p. 14, bottom line, and p. 15, top line: strike all the material included in the parentheses.

p. 15, line 5 under (1) (a): change "would" to "might."

p. 15, lines 14-16: delete "Counselors, for instance, might hand out evaluation forms to every tenth student they counsel, the forms to be turned in with the student's registration materials."

p. 16, at the end of section (c), insert: "Whatever the amount of notice given, it should be uniform throughout the department."

p. 17, insert at the end of line 5: "In non-teaching areas, the staff should be responsible for working out a method of peer evaluation. For peer evaluations to be meaningful, they should represent the judgment of more than one other person."

p. 19, fourth line from the bottom: after "staff;" insert "publishing and maintaining office hours;"

p. 31, line 2 under "Personal Life Style": change "live" to "life."

INTRODUCTION

The 1974-7 compensation agreement for the St. Louis Junior College Distfict contained the following paragraph:

> A Professional Growth Committee will be established, made up of faculty. This committee will recommend criteria for evaluation during the first three years of employment of an individual and evaluation prior to the time of renewal of each five year appointment. The committee will report to the President's Council and the faculties by November 1, 1974. The committee will be formed within two weeks after Board approval and will be composed of one faculty member appointed by the Faculty Association President at each college and two faculty members to be elected by the faculty at each college, election to be conducted by each College President. The chairperson of the committee will be elected by the committee. The committee will develop criteria for evaluation of the first three years of a faculty member's service and evaluation for succeeding five year appointment. In the event the committee fails to arrive at mutually acceptable criteria (President's Council and Professional Growth Committee and faculties) by December 1, 1974, existing criteria and procedures will continue to be used until such time as agreement can be reached.

Consequently, in the late spring of 1974, a Faculty Professional Growth committee was formed, with the following members: Richard Buckman, Leon Gordon, and Edet Ituen, Florissant Valley; Dean Dunbar, Elisabeth McPherson, and Ethel Sawyer, Forest Park; Margaret Johnson, Joseph Longi, and Sandralee Phillips, Meramec. The committee has met several times during the summer of 1974, and almost weekly since the beginning of the fall semester. As a guide to its deliberations, the committee prepared and distributed to all members of the professional staff a questionnaire covering what should be included in evaluations, how much weight should be given each item, and whether teaching effectiveness could best be measured by performance or outcomes. (See Appendix I.) Approximately 300 faculty members responded to the

questionnaires. (See Appendix II, which shows both district and individual campus responses.) Although the questionnaire was left deliberately open-ended (it provided space for "other" in each category), the free responses were so scattered and so varied that it was impossible to tabulate them; nevertheless, some of the suggestions were very helpful, and have been incorporated in this report.

Perhaps the most surprising result of the questionnaire was the low importance the faculty gave to work toward a doctoral degree. This item ranked 21st in a list of 28 possible items on which evaluation might be based; accumulation of graduate subject matter credits ranked 15th. This rating is particularly interesting when we remember that the possession of a doctoral degree has been one of the major requirements for advancement to the rank of full professor, and the accumulation of graduate hours one of the main ways for more rapid promotion on the salary scale. The responses to the questionnaire would seem to show that this method of making promotional decisions has been a mistake and should be seriously reconsidered by all committees which use it as a criterion.

The questionnaire began with the statement, "Because we want these criteria [for evaluation] to represent your ideas, we want your response to a few questions," and throughout this report the committee has been guided, but not bound, by the expressed opinion of the faculty. The questionnaire ended with the invitation: "THE COMMITTEE WILL WELCOME MORE DETAILED WRITTEN RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE DIRECTION ITS REPORT SHOULD TAKE." In the few carefully considered written recommendations the committee did receive, the question was raised as to what the main purpose of evaluations should be: whether they should aim toward raising the quality of teaching or whether

they should attempt to make discriminations on which retention or promotion decisions can be based.

From the beginning, the committee has been aware of an apparent contradiction between the name of the committee, "professional growth," and its charge, to develop criteria for evaluation to be used for decisions affecting retention and promotion. Although we realize that the term "evaluation" is often used for both purposes -- assisting growth and determining promotions , and although we agree that there is clearly a relationship between the two purposes -- the more faculty members "grow," the more valuable they will be to the district -- we also believe that the two purposes must be kept distinct. Our experience in the district, and indeed the national experience, seems to indicate that evaluative processes should incorporate different techniques for the two purposes. A program for improving instruction calls for diagnostic and supportive evaluative systems which will assist the instructor in improving his/her classroom performance; the results of such diagnostic evaluations are ordinarily private, used only by the teacher interested in assessing weaknesses and strengths. An evaluation system designed for salary determinations will not serve diagnostic purposes, since all teachers will have a strong incentive to emphasize their strengths and hide their weaknesses. The results of this type of evaluation are public, in that they are open to inspection and use by those in a position to affect the faculty member's professional future.

Because we believe these two aspects of evaluation must be considered separately, we have broken this report into two parts: Part I deals with Growth and Development; Part II deals with Criteria for Promotional Evaluation.

The committee also investigated the present evaluation policies of the district. Page 52 of the Administrative Procedures Manual, Section 3A.3, contains this statement:

> Evaluation of Professional Staff
>
> Each location shall be responsible for developing a regular procedure for annual evaluation of faculty members and administrators. These procedures will provide for evaluation of faculty by peers, students, supervisors, and the individuals themselves. This procedure will also provide for the evaluation of administrators by staff reporting to them, peers, and supervisors, as well as the administrators themselves. (10/3/73)

Although the committee is uncertain as to how much of the evaluation provided for here is actually being carried out on the three campuses, nothing in this policy conflicts with faculty opinion as expressed in the 1974 questionnaires. More than 80% of those responding believe that class or work observation by supervisors or chairpersons, and written evaluations by supervisors or chairpersons, should be given heavy or moderate weight. More than 70% endorsed class or work observation by peers and written student evaluations; more than 65% endorsed written self-evaluations and written peer evaluations.

And although this policy statement is specific about who should do the evaluating, it makes no statement as to what should be evaluated, or how, nor does it mention why the evaluations are made, whether for growth and improvement or for promotion/retention decisions. In only one area, student evaluation of instruction, could we find a more specific statement. On December 7, 1972 the Junior College District Council approved the following statement:

1. Each department be allowed to design its own form for evaluation.
   a. The results of said evaluation to be available upon request to the Department Chairman, the Division Chairman, the Dean of Instruction and ANYONE else with the permission of the instructor evaluated.

b. Each member of the department be REQUIRED to administer the department's evaluation to students. Student evaluation of instruction would be administered prior to completion of the overall yearly evaluation of each faculty member in order to allow the information contained therein to be given consideration before the letting of contracts.

c. The evaluation form should be given in <u>each different course</u> that the professor instructs but NOT NECESSARILY in each <u>section</u>.

d. That the evaluation form itself contain when (a date), and under what conditions the forms would be available to students.
[all emphasis contained in the original]

That the major purpose of these student evaluations is promotion and retention is made clear from the wording, especially in section (b). Whether the evaluations are also intended to serve as a guide to students in selecting classes and instructors is less clear: does section (d) mean to provide for when and how the evaluations will be given in each class, or does it imply that the <u>results</u> of the student evaluations will be made available to students? This question needs to be answered.

Both of the present procedures on evaluation do, however, rest on a philosophy which the committee believes should be retained: rather than imposing a single rigid evaluation system on the whole district, they place the responsibility on the locations (<u>Administrative Procedures Manual</u>) and on the departments (Council statement of December 1972). If evaluation systems, for either growth or promotion, are to work successfully, they must have the consent and cooperation of everyone involved in the evaluation process. That consent will be given only if departments and divisions feel sure that the purposes of evaluation fit the purposes of the department, the division, the college, and the district, as they see those purposes. They

need to be certain that people are not being evaluated in terms of things for which they did not know they were responsible, or in ways that do not jibe with those responsibilities. Unless faculty members have confidence in the process, any evaluation system, no matter how carefully it is worked out nor how fairly it is administered, will create an atmosphere of suspicion and resentment.

Each department and division must be involved in describing the jobs and responsibilities in its area, determining its educational and professional aims, recommending the kind of growth programs that will help its members develop into better teachers, and deciding how the achievement of the faculty members in its area can be most fairly and effectively measured.

The committee has, therefore, asked each division in the district to

1) decide what should be in its job descriptions and general department aims;
2) agree on what constitutes (or should constitute) professional growth and development in its area;
3) make specific recommendations as to how the four most important elements of evaluation should be measured in its area.

Fulfilling these three requests is not an easy task, and it cannot be done hastily. The committee has asked the departments and divisions to report, in writing, in December and in March, and when those reports come in they should be carefully reviewed, either by this committee or another committee to be elected for the purpose.

The present report, then, is only preliminary to the larger job that must be done. This report recommends that evaluations for faculty growth be kept separate from evaluations for promotion and retention, and makes some suggestions for ways of promoting growth. This report also makes more specific what should be considered in promotional evaluations, and the relative weight each item should be given.

PART I: GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

Programs for growth and development have as their principal aim the general improvement of the district. Such programs are intended to improve what the colleges offer to the community, how they offer it, and how successfully the offerings are received. They are not benefits offered to individuals; they are benefits to the whole. But since colleges are composed of people, improvements in the district must come through the continued growth and development of the college staff.

Although growth programs can do three things: enlarge horizons; maintain skills and techniques already present; and remedy problems, probably their most important function is to discover what the problems are. Until problems have been identified, they cannot be remedied.

Since many growth and development programs will probably be in individual departments or divisions, the district should consider assigning a portion of released time money to divisions to be used at their discretion.

Diagnostic Techniques

Improvement in classroom effectiveness is undoubtedly the most important kind of growth for any teacher, but it is questionable whether significant improvement in instruction can take place without some adequate way of assessing what works and what doesn't. Such assessments, if they are undertaken honestly and openly, must be free of the fear that results will be used for rewarding "good" teachers and punishing "bad" teachers. The purpose of diagnostic evaluations is self-improvement, and whatever is discovered by such methods should be included in promotion decisions only if the teacher involved decides they should be considered, by incorporating them in a self-evaluation.

Although existing diagnostic techniques are far from perfect, several kinds are being successfully used in some colleges. Three methods deserve serious consideration:

a) Videotaping: For this method to give useful results, it is not enough to tape a single class; the first time the television camera appears, both the teacher and the students are likely to behave selfconsciously and "perform." One college which uses this system tapes eighteen hours of class and then randomly selects sections from the beginning, middle, and end of the taped sequence. After the tape has been cut to a reasonable length, the teacher can study it, in private, with colleagues, or perhaps with students. This method affords teachers an opportunity for self-analysis and reflection on their own teaching styles, and a second chance to see how their students are reacting. It is often possible to notice, from the view of the camera, things that go unnoticed while the class is being taught.

b) Trained Observers: This method requires that selected faculty members be specially trained to observe and report what goes on in classrooms. Then the trained faculty members attend several sessions of the same class, discussing with the teacher in non-judgmental and non-evaluative terms what they have seen happening. Since the emphasis here is on teaching methods and their effect, rather than on knowledge of a special discipline, some of the observers should probably be from outside the teacher's own field.

c) Student Input: Because the information we have so far seems to explode the theories which downgrade student evaluations as a reliable measure of classroom effectiveness, the group judgment of students becomes an important part of any diagnostic process. District experience, however, implies that a college-wide evaluation form is too broad and general to provide much

useful information, and national experience seems to indicate the same conclusion. Student evaluation forms must be tailored to fit the courses in which they are used. Kansas State University, for instance, has developed a diagnostic form which allows faculty members to select objectives for individual courses and then correlates the students' responses to those selected purposes. Since the critical factors influencing student evaluation appear to be class size and student motivation, the evaluative technique used at Kansas State takes these two factors into account. Other variables sometimes thought to influence student opinion, such as the grade expected, the year in school, or age, seem to be insignificant. Because the Kansas State procedure seems especially useful, the committee has written for more complete information, and recommends that the data and correlations collected over a five year period be carefully studied.

Whatever diagnostic form is used, there is some danger that if student evaluations are given for both diagnosis and promotion, students will become so bored by the evaluation process that they will respond hastily and carelessly. One possible solution is to give diagnostic evaluations one semester, promotional evaluations the next. Teachers who benefit from the advice on the diagnostic evaluations might find that their promotional evaluations gave them a better rating. If separate forms proved too cumbersome, it should be possible to devise an evaluation instrument in which the diagnostic information could be separated from the promotional information; a portion of the results could be accessible to the administration and the rest could be confidential.

Other Methods for Promoting Growth

The list that follows is far from cplete. It is intended only to suggest some ways that faculty growth can be promoted:

Other Methods for Promoting Growth

a) Discipline Meetings: Although most departments and divisions in the district meet regularly on their own campuses, these meetings are ordinarily devoted to procedural announcements, housekeeping decisions, and committee reports; they are "business" meetings. If, however, members of the same discipline , either on the same campus or on all three campuses, could meet regularly for the sole purpose of demonstrating successful techniques, exchanging successful assignments, or sharing innovative ideas, every faculty member might gain something which could be adapted to his/her own classes. Successful teachers from outside the district, or specialists in certain aspects of the discpline, could be invited as speakers or consultants.

b) Cross-discipline Meetings: One of the problems for many college students is seeing the relationship between what they are taught in one class and what they are taught in another. Often the information or the advice seems not only unrelated but actually contradictory. And many teachers are victims of the same problem: they are unfamiliar with the aims or the philosophy of other courses or other disciplines. Meetings between departments, where the intention was to understand rather than to judge, might help to eliminate these confusions. Actual samples of assignments

and tests, as well as scheduled cross-discipline class visits, could help teachers view themselves as partners in a larger project rather than as isolated representatives of a single field. At these meetings, too, outside consultants, specialists, or observers might assist in faculty growth.

c) Methods Seminars: In whatever fields teachers are working, they face some of the same problems. How can they reach students who are not print-oriented? How can they determine the reading level of the text they are using? How can they frame their assignments so students will be turned on rather than off? How much allowance should they make for unpredictable crises in students' lives? Much of the expertise to deal with these problems is available within the district; some of it might come from outside. Seminars concentrating on some of these problems -- the questions are intended only as examples -- would make a considerable contribution to faculty development.

d) Professional Conferences: No matter how much in-service training is offered within the district, most teachers grow and develop through the stimulation of exchanging ideas with teachers from other areas. To avoid insularity, the district must provide encouragement and support for teachers to attend professional conferences. Teachers must be allowed to provide suitable out-of-class assignments for their classes during the teacher's absence; and they must be given enough financial assistance that attending conferences will not be impossible for those on a tight budget.

None of the suggestions for faculty growth and development made here could be achieved without some cost to the district. All of them would require a commitment of time, from both administrators and faculty, and money, from some source. The need for time is obvious: it would take time to plan the projects, to put them in operation, and to attend them.

It would take money to provide the equipment, materials and staff for a successful videotaping project; to train faculty to act as classroom observers; to acquire tested diagnostic student evaluation systems; to pay for outside specialists and consultants; to increase district attendance at professional conferences. We agree, however, with the first premise in Dr. Fordyce's memorandum of September 19, 1974:

> As an institution established to assist people in the development of their greatest potential, the District should be committed to professional development of each staff member.

The district must, we believe, put at least as much emphasis on growth and development as a means of promoting teaching excellence as it does on growth and development as a measure of who should be promoted.

PART II: CRITERIA FOR PROMOTIONAL EVALUATION

If present district policy were put into operation, all faculty members, like all administrators, would be evaluated annually by their peers, their students, their supervisors, and themselves. This portion of our report offers general guidelines as to what should be included in those evaluations, but it makes no attempt to develop the forms that should be used or to establish quantitative formulae showing where emphasis should be placed. When those decisions are made, they must be made individually by the departments and the divisions.

The committee does recommend, however, that every faculty member being considered for promotion receive a satisfactory rating in each of the four categories to be discussed in section A:

Classroom effectiveness (or job effectiveness, for non-teaching faculty)
Attendance and reliability
Contributions to department and division
Keeping up-to-date in the field

and, in addition, make some contributions in the optional categories to be discussed in section B.

Faculty members who are being considered for retention, and who receive less than satisfactory ratings in any of the four major categories, should be given at least a year to raise their ratings and should be offered all the opportunities outlined in Part I, under Growth and Development, to assist them in their efforts.

In experimental courses where new techniques and programs are being tried, assessment of classroom effectiveness should be diagnostic only. For beginning teachers, too, the emphasis must be on diagnostic evaluation, but during the first year supervisors and peers should work closely with the teacher to determine classroom effectiveness.

The committee further recommends that all faculty who believe that their promotional evaluations give an unfair picture of their effectiveness or their contributions should have clearly specified and widely publicized of appeal.

Section A : Required categories

Faculty being considered for promotion and retention should have satisfactory ratings in all four of these categories.

Classroom effectiveness: By far the most important category on which evaluations should be based -- and by far the most difficult to define, by far the most difficult to measure -- is successful teaching. There are, in general, two approaches to such measurements: performance (what does the teacher do?) and outcomes (what can students do, or what do they know, as a result of what the teacher did?) By a rather large majority (65%) the district faculty prefer to be evaluated on performance, although some of them (nearly 10%) believe a combination of methods should be used. The 25% who favor outcomes, however, seem enough to justify a choice on the part of any faculty member. If teachers are in a discipline where objectives can be quantitatively stated and objectively measured, and if the teachers believe that variations in motivation, ability, and experience can be safely disregarded, they should be free to elect outcome evaluations, measured, for example, in terms of pre- and post-tests, of students' ability to perform prescribed tasks, of scores on professional or standardized examinations.

The majority of the faculty, however, will prefer to be evaluated on performance, and although the questionnaire seems to show some preference for relying primarily on the judgment of supervisors or chairpersons, the committee recommends that each evaluation incorporate opinion from four sources: supervisors; students; peers (including classified staff who work with or

for the faculty member); and the person being evaluated.

In spite of the fact that much of this report is stated in terms that apply mainly to teaching, the committee does not mean to omit faculty who are assigned to non-teaching responsibilities. The success with which librarians or counselors, for instance, perform their assignments is of equal importance to the district. It is essential that specific job descriptions be made available for all non-teaching assignments. The job descriptions should outline responsibilities and expectations in detail and whatever evaluation instruments are used should relate clearly to those descriptions. Non-teaching faculty, too, should have a choice as to how they want their effectiveness evaluated: either on what they are observed to do, or on the results of their doing. And although in some non-teaching assignments, student judgments may be more difficult to obtain than in classrooms, the possibility should not be ignored. Counselors, for instance, might hand out evaluation forms to every tenth student they counsel, the forms to be turned in with the student's registration materials.

Among the ways by which effectiveness can be measured are:

(1) Class or work observation by chairpersons or supervisors

a) A routine checklist should not be used, although some guide as to what should be considered probably ought to be furnished to every supervisor. Instead, a specific descriptive paragraph discussing what went on in the visited class (or the observed job) would be a fairer means of determining effectiveness.

b) To get a true picture of what the faculty member is doing, a supervisor should visit two or three successive sessions of the same class (or make two or three successive job observations). If that is not possible, at least one entire class session must be observed; to do less is to be unfair to the faculty member and

to give a distorted view of what is going on.

c) Although it is a courtesy to ask teachers whether a visit would be convenient, it is probably a mistake to give too much advance notice. If the teacher makes elaborate preparations for the visit, the observer is unlikely to get an accurate impression of a normal class session, and the teacher may actually be put at a disadvantage by worrying too much about the impression to be created. Ordinarily, five or ten minutes advance notice is enough, and if an inexperienced or overly nervous faculty member is obviously thrown off stride by the observation, the supervisor should arrange to attend the next session of the same class or, if necessary, the next.

d) The supervisor's written comments on the class should be given to the teacher within two days after the visit, and time arranged for a discussion of what happened in the class. The faculty member should, of course, have an opportunity to respond in writing to the supervisor's evaluation, as is presently the practice in the district, and that response should become a part of his evaluation.

(2) Class or work observations by peers: To avoid depending on a single judgment, every teacher should have at least one session of one class visited by another teacher who is not acting as a supervisor. The same procedures should be followed in peer visits as in supervisor's visits. And to avoid the possibility of "you-give-me-a-good-rating, I'll-give-you-one," no two teachers should exchange visits; that is, if Professor

A observes Professor B's class, Professor B may not be the observer for Professor A. For this purpose, department and division chairpersons will not be considered peers, since they will already have visited in a supervisory capacity, but teaching department and division chairpersons must be visited by another teacher in their discipline.

(3) Student Evaluations: Because no single evaluation instrument fits the needs of all areas, or all classes, and because students become bored with answering the same questions again and again, each department must work out its own student evaluation form, fitted to its own needs. In addition to the district requirements (see pages 3-4 of this report), the committee suggests that the following guidelines be used:

a) The evaluation forms adopted by a department need not necessarily be the same for all courses within the department, but each evaluation form must be prepared and approved by more than one faculty member.

b) The evaluation forms for each course must be related to the objectives of that course, appropriate to the instructional methods used in the course, and useful for the purposes of promotional evaluation.

c) Copies of the evaluation forms to be used must be filed with the Division Chairperson and the Dean of Instruction before the evaluation forms are given to students. The Chairperson and/or the Dean may review the forms with the department if the suggested forms seem inappropriate for the course objectives, the instructional methods, or the yearly evaluation of teachers.

d) An evaluation must take place in each different course taught by each faculty member each year; evaluations may be given in each section each semester, at the discretion of the faculty member.

e) Each department will decide who will be responsible for giving and collecting the evaluation forms; in one-person departments, the Division Chairperson must be included in the decision. The person who gives and collects the evaluation forms must, in all cases, be someone other than the teacher.

f) Teachers must be consulted in arranging a convenient time for the evaluations to be given.

g) Each department will decide by what date the results will be compiled, but first semester results must be compiled before the overall yearly evaluation of each faculty member is completed.

h) Each department must decide who will compile the results of the evaluations, how they will be compiled, and where the results will be kept. After the results have been compiled, the individual forms may be retained by the department or discarded, according to departmental decision. But in no case will the instructor see the raw evaluations before grades for the semester are given.

i) If summary results are compiled before the end of the semester, teachers may discuss the evaluation results with the class.

j) The department chairperson, the division chairperson, the dean of instruction, and the president of the college may see the evaluation results without the permission of the faculty member,

but not without the faculty member's knowledge. Aside from these authorized persons, any other member of the college may see the results with the permission of the teacher.

k) The results of the evaluations must be kept for not less than three years nor more than five.

(4) Self-evaluations: All faculty members should submit to their chairpersons or supervisors a written assessment of what they have achieved during the year. In addition to the frank evaluation of teaching effectiveness, the assessments may include an account of the optional contributions described in Section B of this report. This self-evaluation is the faculty member's opportunity to keep the chairperson or supervisor reminded of what has been done, and to insure that the completed evaluation contains no misrepresentations.

Attendance and Reliability: Reliability entails faculty members giving as much advance notice of absence as is feasible, and justifying class or job absences to supervisors. Being absent without advance notice is not considered acceptable except in extreme emergencies. Supervisors are responsible for documenting faculty absences so that if a pattern of unjustifiable absence or failure to notify emerges, the lack of attendance and the unreliability can become a negative part of the faculty member's evaluation.

Reliability also includes returning student work promptly; keeping appointments with students or staff; turning grades in on time; keeping accurate records of incompletes, withdrawals, independent study contracts, etc.; responding promptly to memoranda and requests for information; punctuality.

Contributions to Department and Division: Contributing to the department or division includes more than just membership. It involves activities which serve to maintain, develop, or change departmental or divisional policies. Activities included in this category range from regular attendance at meetings, through developing or critiquing courses, to being willing to serve as department or division chairperson. While the list below is not all inclusive, it does illustrate the kind of things that should be considered in assessing contributions to department or division:

working on departmental or divisional committees;

serving as department or division representative on college or district committees;

developing programs and activities which benefit the department or division, for example, organizing and/or sponsoring departmental or divisional clubs;

being willing to accept teaching schedules that adequately cover departmental or divisional needs, provided that awkward or unpopular times are equitably distributed;

responding to departmental or divisional inquiries and requests fully and promptly;

showing willingness to advise other faculty members on work-related problems.

Although the chairperson of the department or division is probably in the best position to evaluate contributions to the department or division, such contributions may also be included in peer evaluations and in self-evaluations.

Keeping Up-to-date in the Field: In the light of growing and changing knowledge in almost every field, involving both ideas and techniques, it is important that no faculty member's knowledge, awareness, or method become obsolete. Each faculty member should show reasonable attempts at, and success in, keeping up with new developments in his/her field. Such attempts can take the form of refresher courses; participation in and contribution to seminars, workshops, and conferences related to the subject area; independent reading in books and journals; or personal investigations undertaken in other ways. Faculty members who publish critiques, reviews, articles, etc., in their fields can be assumed to have convinced editors, at least, that they have kept up with new developments.

Keeping up in the field comprises both tangible and intangible elements. Tangible elements include such things as graduate hours, professional publications or exhibits, attendance at college or district in-service sessions, active participation in professional organizations, keeping abreast of journals, and consultations in the field. Intangible elements include the impressions of other people working in the same field. Such impressions are based on discussions, on knowing who is frequently sought out for ideas and opinions, sometimes on class visitations. In spite of how hard they are to pin down, such impressions, especially if they are shared by more than one person, are usually fairly accurate.

The assumption is that all faculty will, by some method, keep abreast of developments in their fields. This item should count against a faculty member if it can be specifically demonstrated that the faculty member is not aware of, or does not understand, new ideas and approaches that relate to his/her teaching.

Section B: Optional categories

In addition to showing satisfactory performance in all the four areas described in Section A, each faculty member must demonstrate satisfactory performance in several of the areas described below. Certainly no faculty member should be evaluated in all these optional categories, but faculty who fail to make contributions in some categories in each group are performing at a minimal level. The committee recommends that the specific weights to be given each category, and the numbers of items in which faculty should make contributions, be determined only after this system has been used for an experimental period and the faculty have had an opportunity to test and review it.

The categories have been grouped according to the importance the Junior College District faculty believe they should be given. Asterisks indicate categories which should be given special weight in assignments to which they seem particularly applicable.

(1) IMPORTANT - outstanding performance here should be heavily weighted. Innovation in Teaching Methods; Course or Curriculum Development; Development of Instructional Materials: All these categories refer to changes actually used in the faculty member's classes, or in the classes of other members of the department. Work on simple, regular revisions of course methods and materials is expected of all teaching faculty as part of their jobs. If an innovation is to be judged successful, a major difference in methods and/or materials must take place, and significant improvement in results must be shown. The differences should be judged not only by department and division chairpersons but also by other faculty in the department, and a formal evaluative process, in which students are included, should be set up to measure the effectiveness of the innovations. On the other hand, it should be recognized that the

term "experiment" does not guarantee success, and even though some experiments fail, teachers should not be penalized for attempting innovations. And although innovation and experimenting are always important, greater weight should be given to material produced on the faculty member's own time than to material which has already been subsidized by released or extended time, grants, etc.

Ability to Work Smoothly with Peers and Supervisors means approaching professional issues objectively, avoiding personal attacks on other people, and recognizing when comments and suggestions from other people are not meant as personal attacks. Although this category verges on professional ethics, it does not include the kind of unethical behavior which could best be handled by a grievance committee. This category does include respecting and considering points of view other than your own; it does not mean being a nonentity or a "yes man" -- or woman. Because evaluations under this item are usually negative (failure to work smoothly counts against the faculty member being evaluated), both supervisors and peers must be prepared to give specific substantiation to their judgments.

Willingness to Accept Advice or Help means being receptive to suggestions for modification and/or change in areas directly related to the faculty member's duties in the district. It includes advice from administration, colleagues, or students. However, willingness to accept advice should not be interpreted as passively following without question the dictums handed down to the faculty member; instead, it means a kind of openness and a willingness to evaluate one's own actions and to entertain alternatives. Such willingness is especially important when portions of earlier evaluations have indicated that advice or help is needed. But, like the ability to work smoothly with others, this

item is largely negative, and supervisors who believe a faculty member is unwilling to accept advice or help should give specific substantiation.

Availability to Students Outside Required Office Hours refers to the flexibility of instructors, and the degree of their willingness to work with students on a one-to-one basis. Such instructors give individual help at times and under circumstances which require extra effort and time on their part. Student evaluation forms should give information on this point, and further evidence of such extra effort may be contained in the faculty member's self-evaluation. Usually, however, such extra effort will be common knowledge in the department or division and can be included in the supervisor's evaluation.

(2) VALUABLE - contributions in this area help students, faculty members, and colleges.

* * Student Counseling and Placement means giving advice to students in educational, social, and personal matters; referring students to appropriate supportive services both in and outside the district; and advising and placing students in academic and vocational or career programs. For faculty whose main assignment is counseling and placement, success in this area is an essential part of their evaluation; but for faculty whose main assignment is teaching, especially in non-career areas, such counseling should be given considerable weight in their evaluations. Again, evidence of such counseling should be found in student evaluations, and may be contained in the instructor's self-evaluation, in peer evaluations, or in supervisor's evaluations.

Work on College and District Committees means giving time to any committee formed in the district on any level, and having as its charge matters pertaining to some facet of maintaining or changing the policies and procedures of the institution. Mere membership on committees, however, is not enough; the faculty member must make a genuine contribution to the work of the committee. In evaluating the contribution, the importance of the committee, the amount of time it consumes, and the value of what it produces should all be considered. The contribution of the individual faculty member to the work of the committee must be judged by the chairperson of the committee and the other committee members, and the opinion of the committee members is the best way of judging the chairperson's contribution.

* * Performing What You're Teaching is a specialized category, but an important one in some areas, particularly the creative and technical fields. It refers to the fact that effective teaching can often be done by example: for instance, the photographer, composer, artist, or technician who works in a laboratory or studio setting along with or accessible to students, producing or creating with them and thereby setting an example, creates an environment of learning by doing. Creativity is personalized. What better way to learn solutions than by regularly dealing with the problems? And even though the work is done off campus, teachers working in their own fields are expanding their own proficiency and contributing to their own growth. Faculty members can make sure their supervisors know the work they are doing by submitting an annual summary of such activities.

Professional Publications and Exhibits refer to written or created works not a part of an instructor's job description, but which reflect contributions to or leadership in the instructor's field. For example, although the Junior College District is not a research institution, active performance in the discipline can certainly enhance the instructor's and the college's pursuit of excellence. Teachers in the social sciences and the humanities publish in professional journals or produce textbooks, as do teachers in the sciences or business. Teachers in fine arts or in certain technologies produce exhibits which range from on-campus photographic or art showings, for instance, to creative materials assembled for high schools, other colleges, shopping centers, and professional organizations. Here again, faculty can make sure their supervisors know of their work by submitting copies of publications, issuing invitations to exhibits, or submitting an annual summary of such activities.

* * Consultation in Your Own Field, whether paid or unpaid, brings recognition to the district and its potentialities, and draws attention to the competence and function of faculty members. Consultation serves both as a valuable public relations tool and as a way of enlarging the faculty member's own background, effectiveness, and growth in his field. Such consultations, however, should not interfere with the faculty member's campus responsibilities, and classes cannot be cancelled for consultations without pre-arrangement with a supervisor. Teaching courses at other institutions, for pay, is not considered as consultation. Again, faculty members can keep their supervisors informed of their activities, and make their own assessment of the value of their work.

(3) USEFUL: These categories should be given some consideration in evaluations.

* * Development of Community Service or Off-Campus Courses is one kind of service a junior college offers its community. Off-campus courses may be purely for community enrichment or they may be credit offerings taught off campus and refined for a special group, such as offerings geared to the needs of the General Motors plant, for instance, or prison inmates, or the patrons of the county library. Enrichment courses usually deal with special interests or skills, ranging from aircraft maintenance to the zoology of St. Louis County. Although developing and teaching such courses is always a valuable contribution, it should be given very little weight if it is part of the teacher's regular assignment, and less weight if it if undertaken for pay than if the time and services are donated. The faculty member can include such activities in the annual summary submitted to the supervisor.

Unpaid Small Group Tutoring means regularly or occasionally giving additional coaching, drill, explanation, or applied practice to students who request or need it. Such sessions are in addition to normal class and laboratory hours, counseling services, or laboratory clinics, and are voluntary on the faculty member's part. Such contributions may show up in student evaluations, and should be included in the faculty member's summary of what has been accomplished.

* * Student Placement in Community Jobs means (1) helping students find jobs in their field after they have completed their college programs; and (2) finding suitable parttime work, both paid and unpaid, which contributes to students' education in the programs for which they are enrolled. For faculty for whom student placement is part of their assignment, success in placement is an

essential part of the evaluation; for faculty who help with student placement as an additional contribution, finding jobs in areas where the outside employment enhances and compliments the educational activities of the student should become part of the faculty member's evaluation. The evaluation should consider the time and effort expended by the faculty member, as well as whether the student had the experiences the instructor desired for him. Such placement activities are important for faculty members because they keep the faculty up-to-date on the job market in their area of teaching and help them maintain contacts in the community, contacts that may directly affect the continued success of their programs. This item is especially important for faculty working in career programs, but it can also apply to faculty in academic areas.

* * Responsibility for Environmental Tasks comprises maintenance, clean-up, and in some cases inventory checks for laboratories, studios, and other work areas where no paid assistant is available, or, if assistance is available, it includes supervising the assistant. In other words, these are tasks which must be done for which the instructor is not paid, either in money or in workload credit. In evaluating contributions in this area, consideration should be given to reliability, to the amount of work involved, and to the spirit in which the extra work is done.

Enrichment Courses Outside Your Field includes graduate or undergraduate courses, taken for credit, but not within your discipline. Because a broad background of knowledge is often more valuable in community college teaching than a narrow, in-depth approach, such study can be as useful to

teachers as intensive study in their own fields. Institutions which believe that education is the ability to relate your discipline to other disciplines in order to promote learning and enhance the learning experience should give credit for any broadening educational experiences. Credit hours are, of course, easy to count, but the evaluation should show what courses were taken, and where.

Accumulation of Graduate Subject Matter Credits means taking additional work, for credit, in your own discipline. How heavily such courses should be weighted in evaluations depends on how closely the graduate work relates to the teacher's assignment, or to an assignment the teacher is likely to be given.

Work Toward a Doctoral Degree can, in some circles and in the eyes of some accrediting agencies, enhance the prestige of the institution although, ordinarily, the mere possession of an advanced degree has little beneficial effect on teaching performance. In the same way, work toward advanced degrees for faculty in career programs may or may not affect teaching effectiveness.

Attendance at In-Service Courses means taking advantage of opportunities for professional growth sponsored, planned, and organized by the administration of the district or campus, the division, or the department, for the purpose of (1) informing faculty of alternative ways of increasing classroom effectiveness; (2) updating faculty in content specialties; (3) informing faculty of services and programs available to them or to students. Through in-service courses faculty can acquire new perceptions and insights as to their role and function in the district. Changes that occur in faculty behavior as a result of these courses is certainly one facet of faculty

growth, and a willingness to attend such courses to investigate their applicability should be considered in faculty evaluation in about the same proportion as courses taken for credit at other institutions.

Advising Student Clubs means serving as the faculty member officially responsible for the operation of the club or activity. Such responsibility can range from merely lending one's name to the application sheet, which should be given little if any credit, to heavy involvement in meetings, trips and activities of the club -- often a considerable contribution to the college. Faculty members can make their supervisors aware of the extent of their contributions in this area by describing what they have done in the annual summary of their activities.

Community Service refers to voluntary work with or for people, and groups of people, in the college community and the larger communities of which the college is a part. This includes, for example, work with a redevelopment drive, neighborhood planning, the United Fund, the metropolitan Red Cross, or Malcolm Bliss Hospital, but very little weight should be given to activities which stem directly from the personal interests and choices of the faculty member and his/her family, and which do little to arouse interest in the college or the district. Faculty members who want community service included in their evaluation should submit an account of what they have done during the year, and some justification as to why it should be considered.

Contributions to the Welfare of the College or District refers to activities, general or specific, not previously covered, but which can be interpreted as

contributing to the growth, development, and welfare of the college or district. It might include the loan of a staff member's personal art works for exhibit on college campuses, the assisting or consultation in departmental, divisional, or program development between colleges, participation in a speaker's bureau, contributing to the establishment or new campus activities, helping to secure external funding for college or district programs, attracting scholarships from outside groups, etc. Any such contributions to the welfare of the college or district can be included in the faculty member's annual summary of his activities.

Section C: Factors to be Omitted from all Evaluations

None of the following should be considered in any faculty evaluation, either positively or negatively:

Personal Life Style refers to the manner, circumstances, and situations in which an individual chooses to spend his non-working live. The term comprises personal value judgments, political activity, religious affiliations, and similar habitual or occasional responses related to individual choice. The term should not be confused with academic freedom, where it is understood that facets of individual life style must not be seen as representative of institutional attitudes, nor must individual life style interfere with performing one's professional responsibilities -- for instance, meeting classes irregularly, responding carelessly to normal office hours, or conducting classes ineffectively would be considered interference with professional obligations.

Political Activity Outside the Classroom obviously includes the right to speak for unpopular causes without jeopardizing your job, but it also includes the idea that no evaluation credit should be given for espousing popular causes: working for the passage of bond issues, for instance. This definition also includes, as political activity, running for any public office, but does not include time given to advisory boards or other such projects, which should be evaluated as community service.

Self Promotion refers to individuals that attempt to better their positions by their over-zealousness to serve in various capacities, but who in fact are not responsible in terms of participation and productivity, or to people who endeavor to ingratiate themselves with those in influence and authority. It also includes those who attempt to use personality as a substitute for performance.

CONCLUSION

No definitive workable evaluation system can be developed in a single step, or by a single committee. It must be a step-by-step process, with everyone who is to be evaluated involved in developing the evaluation system. The recommendations made in this report are a first step. If they are adopted, they can be used as guidelines for making evaluations in the 1974-5 year, and as an outline for departments and divisions to follow as they work out their own plans. The committee recommends that the district adopt the following timetable:

1974-5: (1) Departments and divisions should use the recommendations in this report as general guidelines for making evaluations.

(2) As reports from departments and divisions come in, the plans and procedures for evaluation should be reviewed and revised as needed.

1975-6: The district should use the revised plans and procedures on an experimental basis.

1976-7: The evaluation system should be modified as experience indicates and put into effect.

In making these recommendations, we are aware that we are asking for the commitment of a tremendous amount of time and effort. We are asking departments and divisions to undertake a process of self-examination that will result in specific, written statements with which the faculty in those

departments and divisions can live. We are asking supervisors and chairpersons to cooperate in complicating their jobs, and to make serious and difficult decisions.

We believe, however, that if decisions on promotion and retention are to be based on genuine evaluation, rather than on hunches and hope, the evaluation process cannot remain superficial or secret. Supervisors and chairpersons must do more than check boxes on a form, and faculty must participate in the process.

FACULTY PROFESSIONAL GROWTH COMMITTEE

Richard Buckman
Dean Dunbar
Leon Gordon
Edet Ituen
Margaret Johnson
Joseph Longi
Sandralee Phillips
Ethel Sawyer
Elisabeth McPherson, Chairperson

TO: All Junior College District of St. Louis Faculty
FROM: Faculty Professional Growth Committee

As you know, the Professional Growth Committee has been charged with developing criteria to be used in the evaluation of JCD faculty. Because we want these criteria to represent your ideas, we want your response to a few questions. Please complete this short questionnaire and return it, by August 26, to one of the committee members.

In responding to suggested items, please check all those you think should or should not be used, using the following scale:

5 - should be heavily weighted
3 - should be given moderate weight
1 - should be considered but given little weight
0 - should not be considered at all

I. Which of these items do you think should be included in faculty evaluation? (The committee is not endorsing any item; we have merely compiled a list of things that are sometimes, in some colleges, considered.)

_____ advising student clubs or activities
_____ innovation in teaching methods
_____ course or curriculum development
_____ work toward a doctoral degree
_____ political activity outside the campus
_____ student counseling and placement
_____ contributions to department/division
_____ development of instructional materials
_____ work on college and/or district committees
_____ unpaid individual or small group tutoring
_____ student placement in community jobs
_____ professional publications or exhibits
_____ classroom effectiveness, however measured
_____ availability to students outside required office hours
_____ accumulation of graduate subject matter credits
_____ attendance at in-service, non-credit, courses offered by college or district
_____ taking enrichment courses outside your own field
_____ willingness to accept advice or help
_____ development of community service or off-campus courses if not a primary assigned responsibility
_____ contributions to local, state, or national professional organizations
_____ personal life style
_____ community service, as evidenced by voluntary, appointive, or elective responsibilities
_____ personality and self-promotion
_____ attendance and reliability
_____ performing what you're teaching (i.e., art teachers who are working artists, English teachers who produce poetry, science teachers who do research)
_____ unpaid consultation in your own field
_____ ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors
_____ responsibility for environmental tasks (issuance and monitoring of physical supplies, cleanup in labs, theaters, etc., when student assistance is not available)
_____ What else?_____

II. Which way of measuring faculty accomplishment do you prefer? (Please check only one)

_____ PERFORMANCE, as measured by observations, judgment of chairpersons, peers, students, supervisors, etc.
_____ OUTCOMES, as measured against specified individualized goals or by student achievement or accomplishment, or both
_____ OTHER (be specific)_____

III. In measuring performance, which of these methods should or should not be used? (Please use the scale given on page 1)

_____ class observation or work observation by supervisors or chairpersons
_____ class observation or work observation by peers
_____ written student evaluations
_____ written peer evaluations
_____ written self-evaluations
_____ written evaluations by chairpersons or supervisors
_____ grievances filed or complaints received from students
_____ grievances filed or complaints received from peers
_____ grievances filed or complaints received from chairpersons or supervisors
_____ other (be specific)_____

IV. In measuring outcomes, which of these methods should or should not be used? (Please use the scale given on page 1)

_____ for teachers, an answer to the question, "Did the learner learn what I intended that she/he learn?"
_____ for non-teaching faculty, an answer to the question, "Have the specified goals I set for the year been met?"
_____ summary of passing grades achieved by students
_____ quantity of work produced in non-teaching assignments
_____ achievement of students as measured by pre- and post-tests
_____ summary of students meeting specified behavioral objectives
_____ summary of specified behavioral objectives met by non-teaching faculty
_____ for teachers, number of student credit hours produced each semester
_____ other (be specific)_____

V. OPTIONAL: Please don't delay returning this questionnaire because you find this question difficult to answer. If you can answer, do; if you can't, leave it blank. If you have been at least a year with the district, what do you think have been the criteria used in evaluating you in the past? Please begin with those you think have been given the most weight and end with those given the least weight.

_____
_____
_____
_____

You need not sign your name to this questionnaire, but the following information will be helpful to the committee:

Location (college)_____ Department or division_____
Number of years with the JCD_____ Female_____ Male_____ Fulltime___ Parttime_____
Classroom teacher with full load____ Classroom teacher with released time _____
Counselor/advisor_____ Instructional Resource faculty _____
Department chairperson teaching fewer than 12 hours _____ Department chairperson teaching 12 hours, not including overload____ Division chairperson, some teaching _____
Division chairperson, no teaching_____ Other (please specify)_____

THE COMMITTEE WILL WELCOME MORE DETAILED WRITTEN RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO THE DIRECTION ITS REPORT SHOULD TAKE. IF YOU WANT TO MAKE SUCH RECOMMENDATIONS, PLEASE GIVE THEM TO SOME COMMITTEE MEMBER, SIGNED OR UNSIGNED, AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

Faculty Professional Growth Committee:

Rich Buckman, FVCC	Margaret Johnson, MCC	Dean Dunbar, FPCC
Leon Gordon, FVCC	Joseph Longi, MCC	Ethel Sawyer, FPCC
Edet B. Ituen, FVCC	Sandy Phillips, MCC	Liz McPherson, FPCC (Chairperson)

Responses to Faculty Professional Growth Questionnaire
DISTRICTWIDE, combining FPCC, [illegible], and Meramec
August, 1974

I. "Which of these items do you think should be included in faculty evaluation?" (The items are arranged in the order of importance given them by district faculty rather than in the order used in the questionnaire.)

Average weight	Item	Number of responses in each category: Heavily weighted	Moderately weighted	Slightly weighted	Not counted at all
4.63	Classroom effectiveness however measured	250	31	9	2
4.03	Attendance and reliability	184	89	22	5
3.76	Contributions to department/division	138	126	21	5
3.73	Development of instructional materials	139	128	25	4
3.72	Course or curriculum development	140	120	29	4
3.47	Innovation in teaching methods	125	106	35	6
3.28	Ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors	78	136	113	62
3.08	Availability to students outside required office hours	94	123	63	13
2.82	Willingness to accept advice or help	78	121	69	23
2.57	Student counseling and placement	64	122	84	29
2.56	Work on college and/or district committees	32	157	81	12
2.44	Performing what you're teaching (i.e.,art teachers who are working artists,etc.)	54	122	85	34
2.12	Professional publications or exhibits	36	106	117	31
2.09	Contributions to professional associations	25	119	102	33
2.05	Accumulation of graduate subject matter credits	28	115	119	33
2.02	Development of community service or off-campus courses if not primary job	24	123	98	45
1.99	Unpaid individual or small group tutoring	31	108	87	58
1.80	Attendance at in-service, non-credit courses offered by college or district	16	108	121	47
1.77	Student placement in community jobs	28	95	90	77
1.77	Work toward a doctoral degree	22	89	122	49
1.75	Responsibility for environmental tasks (monitoring supplies, clean-up,etc.)	28	81	113	62
1.66	Advising student clubs or activities	14	87	156	37
1.64	Community service	14	78	124	81
1.63	Taking enrichment courses outside your own field	17	82	143	49
1.60	Unpaid consultation in your own field	22	91	101	89
1.43	Personality and self-promotion	27	59	107	99
0.67	Political activity outside the campus	3	47	67	214
0.45	Personal life style	4	22	44	219

II. "Which way of measuring faculty accomplishment do you prefer?"

PERFORMANCE, as measured by observations, judgment of chairpersons, peers, students, supervisors, etc. 223
OUTCOMES, as measured against specified individualized goals or by student achievement or accomplishment, or both 92
OTHER (most people who said other said a combination fitting the discipline. 21

III. "In measuring performance, which of these methods should or should not be used?"

Average Weight	Item	Number of responses in each category: Heavily weighted	Moderately weighted	Slightly weighted	Not counted at all
3.34	Class observation or work observation by supervisors or chairpersons	105	124	33	16
3.20	Written evaluations by chairpersons or supervisors	86	146	38	13
3.04	Class observation or work observation by peers	99	104	46	31
3.01	Written student evaluations	89	125	62	17
2.80	Written self-evaluations	76	114	47	38
2.66	Written peer evaluations	68	115	50	44
2.55	Grievances filed or complaints received from chairpersons or supervisors	55	121	61	37
2.11	Grievances filed or complaints received from peers	34	111	84	49
2.02	Grievances filed or complaints received from students	34	94	99	46

IV. "In measuring outcomes. which of these methods should or should not be used?"

3.12	For non-teaching faculty, an answer to the question, "Have the specified goals I set for the year been met?"	104	61	18	48
2.94	For teachers, an answer to the question, "Did the learner learn what I intended that he/she learn?"	146	75	17	31
2.27	Achievement of students as measured by pre- and post-tests	53	99	52	66
2.22	Summary of students meeting specified behavioral objectives	47	101	49	68
1.94	Summary of specified behavioral objectives met by non-teaching faculty	37	70	36	79
1.64	Quantity of work produced in non-teaching assignments	23	75	68	82
1.35	Summary of passing grades achieved by students	16	68	75	106
1.14	For teachers, number of student credit hours produced each semester	10	59	63	122

V. "If you have been at least a year with the district, what do you think have been the criteria used in evaluating you in the past?"

(This was an optional question; few people answered it, and of those who did, the answers were so varied they were impossible to tabulate.)

FLORISSANT VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Responses to Faculty Professional Growth Questionnaire

I. "Which of these items do you think should be included in faculty evaluation?" (The answers are arranged in the order of importance given them by FVCC faculty, rather than in the order used in the questionnaire.)

Average weight	Item	Number of responses in each category: Heavily weighted	Moderately weighted	Slightly weighted	Not counted at all
4.60	Classroom effectiveness, however measured	100	12	3	1
4.20	Attendance and reliability	79	30	7	2
3.85	Contributions to department/division	62	45	6	3
3.66	Development of instructional materials	54	49	12	2
3.56	Course or curriculum development	50	51	14	2
3.47	Innovation in teaching methods	47	51	18	2
3.33	Ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors	40	58	16	2
3.05	Availability to students outside required office hours	37	48	28	6
2.76	Willingness to accept advice or help	27	53	29	9
2.68	Student counseling and placement	24	55	29	14
2.56	Performing what you're teaching (i.e., art teachers who are working artists, etc.)	24	50	30	15
2.41	Work on college and/or district committees	13	60	37	6
2.26	Accumulation of graduate subject matter credits	14	51	42	10
2.19	Professional publications or exhibits	18	41	44	13
1.90	Development of community service or off-campus courses if not a primary assigned responsibility	10	49	36	19
1.94	Work toward a doctoral degree	11	48	29	20
1.88	Contributions to local, state, or national professional organizations	10	46	32	12
1.78	Student placement in community jobs	11	40	34	32
1.70	Unpaid individual or small group tutoring	7	43	35	29
1.69	Attendance at in-service, non-credit, courses offered by college or district	4	44	46	23
1.62	Advising student clubs or activities	5	35	60	16
1.58	Unpaid consultation in your own field	6	38	41	32
1.56	Responsibility for environmental tasks (monitoring supplies, clean-up, etc.)	8	31	50	27
1.48	Taking enrichment courses outside your own field	2	37	53	25
1.38	Personality and self-promotion	8	25	47	38
1.34	Community service, as evidenced by voluntary, appointive, or elective responsibilities	4	28	53	33
1.14	Political activity outside the campus	2	32	28	55
.41	Personal life style	2	8	14	91

II. "Which way of measuring faculty accomplishment do you prefer?"

2.19	PERFORMANCE, as measured by observations, judgment of chairpersons, peers, students, supervisors, etc.	7	73	3	11
.95	OUTCOMES, as measured against specified individualized goals or by student achievement or accomplishment, or both	0	37	1	45

(over)

III. "In measuring performance, which of these methods should or should not be used?"

Average weight	Item	Number of responses in each category: Heavily weighted	Moderately weighted	Slightly weighted	Not counted at all
3.31	Written student evaluations	40	54	26	10
3.09	Class observation or work observation by supervisors or chairpersons	41	47	16	15
3.02	Written evaluations by chairpersons or supervisors	30	62	18	11
2.88	Class observation or work observation by peers	39	40	23	15
2.58	Written self-evaluations	25	52	22	18
2.52	Written peer evaluations	24	52	20	19
2.40	Grievances filed or complaints received from chairpersons or supervisors	20	51	28	17
2.07	Grievances filed or complaints received from peers	14	45	38	22
1.95	Grievances filed or complaints received from students	14	37	48	17

IV. "In measuring outcomes, which of these methods should or should not be used?"

2.91	For teachers, an answer to the question, "Did the learner learn what I intended that he/she learn?"	45	35	11	25
2.32	For non-teaching faculty, an answer to the question, "Have the specified goals I set for the year been met?"	38	24	12	43
1.73	Achievement of students as measured by pre- and post-tests	15	36	20	44
1.59	Summary of students meeting specified behavioral objectives	11	36	23	47
1.51	Quantity of work produced in non-teaching assignments	12	31	24	50
1.31	Summary of specified behavioral objectives met by non-teaching faculty	10	29	17	59
1.06	Summary of passing grades achieved by students	5	22	34	55
1.05	For teachers, number of student credit hours produced each semester	5	36	20	62

V. "If you have been at least a year with the district, what do you think have been the criteria used in evaluating you in the past?"

(This was an optional question: few people answered it, and of those who did, the answers were so varied they were impossible to tabulate.)

FOREST PARK COMMUNITY COLLEGE ONLY August, 1974

Responses to Faculty Professional Growth Questionnaire

I. "Which of these items do you think should be included in faculty evaluation?" (The answers are arranged in the order of importance given them by FPCC faculty, rather than in the order used in the questionnaire.)

Average weight	Item	Number of responses in each category: Heavily weighted	Moderately weighted	Slightly weighted	Not counted at all
4.81	Classroom effectiveness however measured	76	6	1	0
3.96	Course or curriculum development	46	30	5	1
3.87	Innovation in teaching methods	43	32	6	1
3.71	Development of instructional materials	36	41	5	1
3.61	Contributions to department or division	33	41	8	0
3.16	Ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors	25	39	17	1
3.09	Availability to students outside required office hours	26	34	18	3
2.86	Willingness to accept advice or help	24	32	16	9
2.69	Student counseling and placement	17	38	25	3
2.55	Attendance and reliability	25	39	17	1
2.47	Work on college and/or district committees	6	48	26	1
2.32	Performing what you're teaching (i.e., art teachers who are working artists, etc.)	15	26	35	5
2.16	Unpaid individual or small group tutoring	11	31	25	13
2.06	Contributions to professional organizations	7	33	33	8
2.05	Professional publications or exhibits	9	29	36	8
1.94	Attendance at in-service, non-credit courses offered by college or district	7	30	34	11
1.89	Development of community service or off-campus courses if not main job	7	29	31	14
1.81	Accumulation of graduate subject matter credits	7	25	37	12
1.75	Responsibility for environmental tasks - (monitoring supplies, clean-up, etc.)	9	22	31	19
1.73	Unpaid consultation in your own field	6	26	30	18
1.66	Taking enrichment courses outside own field	6	21	43	12
1.64	Student placement in community jobs	5	27	25	23
1.58	Community service	7	21	30	23
1.58	Work toward a doctoral degree	5	19	46	11
1.49	Advising student clubs or activities	2	22	52	10
1.28	Personality and self-promotion	11	13	26	33
.44	Political activity outside the campus	1	7	11	66
.36	Personal life style	1	3	15	62

II. "Which way of measuring faculty accomplishment do you prefer?"

PERFORMANCE, as measured by observations, judgment of chairpersons, peers, students, supervisors, etc. 59

OUTCOMES, as measured against specified individualized goals or by student achievement or accomplishment, or both 19

OTHER (most people who said other said a combination fitting the discipline) -13

III. "In measuring performance, which of these methods should or should not be used?"

Average weight	Item	Number of responses in each category: Heavily weighted	Moderately weighted	Slightly weighted	Not counted at all
3.76	Class observation or work observation or work observation by supervisors or chairpersons	35	35	6	0
3.49	Written evaluations by chairpersons or supervisors	30	34	10	1
3.39	Written student evaluations	32	28	14	2
2.97	Class observation or work observation by peers	23	31	9	10
2.68	Grievances filed or complaints received from chairpersons or supervisors	16	33	14	9
2.67	Written self-evaluations	19	28	16	10
2.48	Written peer evaluations	18	27	15	15
2.12	Grievances filed or complaints received from students	10	29	18	16
2.09	Grievances filed or complaints received from peers	10	27	22	14

IV. "In measuring outcomes, which of these methods should or should not be used?"

4.16	For teachers, an answer to the question, "Did the learner learn what I intended that he/she learn?"	50	19	5	1
4.03	For non-teaching faculty, an answer to the question, "Have the specified goals I set for the year been met?"	35	17	4	1
2.87	Summary of students meeting specified behavioral objectives	17	34	8	9
2.71	Summary of specified behavioral objectives met by non-teaching faculty	13	22	10	7
2.54	Achievement of students as measured by pre- and post-tests	16	28	19	9
1.88	Quantity of work produced in non-teaching assignments	6	23	20	14
1.77	Summary of passing grades achieved by students	6	25	19	20
1.41	For teachers, number of student credit hours produced each semester	2	21	19	23

V. "If you have been at least a year with the district, what do you think have been the criteria used in evaluating you in the past?"

(This was an optional question; few people answered it, and of those who did, the answers were so varied they were impossible to tabulate.)

Results of the

Faculty Professional Growth Committee

Survey

Meramec Faculty Only

Listed below are items included in faculty evaluation in order of popularity. The numbers on the left hand side is the average score based on a 0 - 5 scale.

4.69	classroom effectiveness, however measured
4.00	attendance and reliability
3.81	development of instructional materials
3.78	course or curriculum development
3.62	contributions to department/division
3.5	innovation in teaching methods
3.3	ability to work smoothly with peers and supervisors
3.01	willingness to accept advice or help
2.95	availability to students outside required office hours
2.59	work on college and/or district committees
2.35	performing what you're teaching (i.e., art teachers who are working artists, English teachers who produce poetry, science teachers who do reasearch)
2.09	development of community service or off-campus courses if not a primary assigned responsibility
2.03	professional publications or exhibits
1.97	contributions to local, state, or national professional organizations
1.96	unpaid individual or small group tutoring
1.91	student counseling and placement
1.88	accumulation of graduate subject matter credits
1.81	attendance at in-service, non-credit, courses offered by college or district
1.70	taking enrichment courses outside your own field
1.70	responsibility for environmental tasks (issuance and monitoring of physical supplies, cleanup in labs, theaters, etc., when student assistance is not available)
1.69	advising student clubs or activities
1.65	work toward a doctoral degree
1.62	unpaid consultation in your own field
1.61	community service, as evidenced by voluntary, appointive, or elective responsibilities
1.61	student placement in community jobs
1.48	personality and self-promotion
.61	political activity outside the campus
.52	personal life style

Preference for measuring faculty accomplishment

Total	
84	PERFORMANCE
32	OUTCOMES
8	other

Methods prefered in measuring performance, placed in order.

3.42	class observation or work observation by supervisors or chairpersons
3.29	written evaluations by chairpersons or supervisors
3.20	class observation or work observation by peers
2.98	written self-evaluations
2.77	written student evaluations
2.75	written peer evaluations
2.56	grievances files or complaints received from chairpersons or supervisors
2.15	grievances filed or complaints received from peers
1.86	grievances filed or complaints received from students

Methods prefered in measuring outcomes, placed in order.

4.15	for teachers, an answer to the question, "Did the learner learn what I intended that she/he learn?'
3.64	for non-teaching faculty, an answer to the question, "Have the specified goals I set for the year been met?"
2.72	achievement of students as measured by pre- and post-tests.
2.56	summary of students meeting specified behavioral objectives
2.25	summary of specified behavioral objectives met by non-teaching faculty
1.54	quantity of work produced in non-teaching assignments
1.48	for teachers, number of student credit hours produced each semester

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 6 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES